



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/021,563

10/22/2001

Mark H. Lucovsky

3080

9308

7590

12/29/2005

Albert S Michalik PLLC
704 228th Avenue NE
Suite 193
Sammamish, WA 98074

EXAMINER

CHOJNACKI, MELLISSA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2164

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,563

Applicant(s)

LUCOVSKY ET AL.

Examiner

Mellissa M. Chojnacki

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date September 15, 2005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on October 11, 2005, claims 1-3 have been cancelled; claims 4, 6-19, 21, 35 and 41 have been amended, and no new claims have been added per applicant's request. Therefore, claims 4-43 are presently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 4-40, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

21, 26, 35
sl Claims 4, 19, ~~26~~ and ~~35~~ recite the limitation "providing structure and meaning", which renders the claim vague and indefinite, because it is unclear as to what "meaning" signifies in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2164

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4-5, 7-22, 35-37, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olivier (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,885) in view of Birrell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,551).

As to claim 4, Olivier teaches a computer network (See column 4, lines 60-63), a method comprising,

constructing an inbox document including at least part of the requested inbox data, and including at least part of a defined schema for inbox data in a markup language (See column 5, lines 1-5; column 16, lines 25-29; column 25, lines 21-41), the defined schema providing structure and meaning to the inbox data and interpreted by the service running on the device (See *).

Olivier does not teach receiving a request from a device having a service running thereon using a service to service protocol to retrieve inbox data from a data store, the request including associated identity information; reading from the data store to obtain inbox data in response to the request, wherein access to the data store is based on the associated identity information; and returning the inbox document in response to the device request.

Birrell et al. teaches a web-base electronic mail service apparatus and method using full text and label indexing (See abstract), in which he teaches receiving a request from a device having a service running thereon using a service to service protocol to retrieve inbox data from a data store (See column 5, lines 29-43), the request including

Art Unit: 2164

associated identity information (See column 5, lines 29-43, where "password" is read on "identity information"; also see column 13, line 41, where "log-in window" is read on "identity information"; also see column 16, lines 40-43); reading from the data store to obtain inbox data in response to the request, wherein access to the data store is based on the associated identity information (See column 5, lines 29-43. It is inherent that in order to view inbox documents one must logon to an email account using a username and password as "identity information"; also see column 14, lines 48-49"; also see column 16, lines 40-43); and returning the inbox document in response to the device request (See column 14, lines 48-49; column 16, lines 3-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Olivier, to include receiving a request from a device having a service running thereon using a service to service protocol to retrieve inbox data from a data store, the request including associated identity information; reading from the data store to obtain inbox data in response to the request, wherein access to the data store is based on the associated identity information; and returning the inbox document in response to the device request.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Olivier, by the teachings of Birrell et al. because receiving a request from a device having a service running thereon using a service to service protocol to retrieve inbox data from a data store, the request including associated identity information; reading from the data store to obtain inbox data in response to the request, wherein access to the data store is based on the associated

Art Unit: 2164

identity information; and returning the inbox document in response to the device request would allow the user to interchange useful information, in a number of different presentation modalities, in a timely and convenient manner (See Birrell et al., column 1, lines 21-30).

As to claims 5 and 20, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the schema includes at least one defined field for extending the schema (See Birrell et al., column 14, lines 58-63; column 15, lines 27-31).

As to claim 7, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the schema comprises at least one defined field corresponding to a simple-mail-transfer-protocol mail account (See Olivier, column 18, lines 60-62; also see Birrell et al., column 14, lines 58-63).

As to claim 8, Olivier as modified, teaches the schema comprises at least one defined field corresponding to a sender's email address (See Birrell et al., column 7, lines 46-49, where "sender's email address" is read on "from"; also see column 9, lines 59-62).

As to claim 9, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the schema comprises at least one defined field corresponding to a recipient's email address (See Birrell et al., column 14, lines 63-67; It is inherent when sending a "reply" message to sender(s) the "recipient(s) email address" is listed in the send filed of the email).

As to claim 10, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the schema comprises at least one defined field corresponding to a subject of an email (See Olivier, column 13, lines 32-35; also see Birrell et al., column 7, lines 46-49).

As to claim 11, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the schema comprises at least one defined field corresponding to an incoming server name (See Olivier, column 3, lines 18-22; column 5, lines 6-9).

As to claim 12, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the schema comprises at least one defined field corresponding to an outgoing server name (See Olivier, column 17, lines 40-43).

As to claim 13, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the schema comprises at least one defined field corresponding to a password (See Birrell et al., column 5, lines 32-45).

As to claim 14, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the schema comprises at least one defined field corresponding to a user name (See Olivier, column 7, lines 3-7, lines 11-13).

As to claim 15, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the schema comprises at least one defined field corresponding to a size of an email (See Olivier, column 20, lines 4-6; also see Birrell et al., column 7, lines 1-5).

As to claim 16, Olivier as modified, teaches the schema comprises at least one defined field corresponding to a date of an email (See Olivier, column 11, lines 60-64; also see Birrell et al., column 5, lines 53-67; column 7, lines 46-49).

As to claim 17, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the schema comprises at least one defined field corresponding to content of an email (See Olivier, column 6, lines 17-20; also see Birrell et al., column 6, lines 64-66).

As to claim 18, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to an attachment to an email (See Birrell et al., column 15, lines 27-31).

As to claim 19, Olivier teaches a computer-readable medium (See column 4, lines 48-49) having computer-executable instructions for:

constructing an inbox document including at least part of the requested inbox data, and including at least part of a defined schema for inbox data in a markup language (See column 5, lines 1-5; column 16, lines 25-29; column 25, lines 21-41), the

defined schema providing structure and meaning to the inbox data and interpreted by the service running on the device (See *).

Olivier does not teach receiving a request from a device having a service running thereon using a service to service protocol to retrieve inbox data from a data store, the request including associated identity information; reading from the data store to obtain inbox data in response to the request, wherein access to the data store is based on the associated identity information; and returning the inbox document in response to the device request.

Birrell et al. teaches a web-base electronic mail service apparatus and method using full text and label indexing (See abstract), in which he teaches receiving a request from a device having a service running thereon using a service to service protocol to retrieve inbox data from a data store (See column 5, lines 29-43), the request including associated identity information (See column 5, lines 29-43, where “password” is read on “identity information”; also see column 13, line 41, where “log-in window” is read on “identity information”; also see column 16, lines 40-43); reading from the data store to obtain inbox data in response to the request, wherein access to the data store is based on the associated identity information (See column 5, lines 29-43. It is inherent that in order to view inbox documents one must logon to an email account using a username and password as “identity information”; also see column 14, lines 48-49”; also see column 16, lines 40-43); and returning the inbox document in response to the device request (See column 14, lines 48-49; column 16, lines 3-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Olivier, to include receiving a request from a device having a service running thereon using a service to service protocol to retrieve inbox data from a data store, the request including associated identity information; reading from the data store to obtain inbox data in response to the request, wherein access to the data store is based on the associated identity information; and returning the inbox document in response to the device request.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Olivier, by the teachings of Birrell et al. because receiving a request from a device having a service running thereon using a service to service protocol to retrieve inbox data from a data store, the request including associated identity information; reading from the data store to obtain inbox data in response to the request, wherein access to the data store is based on the associated identity information; and returning the inbox document in response to the device request would allow the user to interchange useful information, in a number of different presentation modalities, in a timely and convenient manner (See Birrell et al., column 1, lines 21-30).

As to claim 21, Olivier teaches in a computer network (See column 4, lines 60-63), a method comprising,

if the request is allowable, returning a document to the device, the document including at least part of the requested data, the document arranged according to a schema in a markup language associated with a service running on the device (See

column 5, lines 1-5; column 16, lines 25-29; column 25, lines 21-41), the schema providing structure and meaning to the inbox data and interpreted by the service running on the device (See *).

Olivier does not teach accessing a network using a device, the accessing including providing associated identity information corresponding to the device; requesting data from a service accessible via the network, the request based on the associated identity information; determining if the request is an allowable request based on the associated identity information.

Birrell et al. teaches a web-base electronic mail service apparatus and method using full text and label indexing (See abstract), in which he teaches accessing a network using a device (See abstract, where “device” is read on “client computers”), the accessing including providing associated identity information corresponding to the device (See column 5, lines 29-43);

requesting data from a service accessible via the network (See column 15, lines 58-63; column 16, lines 3-14), the request based on the associated identity information (See column 5, lines 29-43, where “password” is read on “identity information”; also see column 13, line 41, where “log-in window” is read on “identity information”; also see column 16, lines 40-43);

determining if the request is an allowable request based on the associated identity information (See column 5, lines 29-43. It is inherent that in order to view inbox documents one must logon to an email account using a username and password as

"identity information"; also see column 14, lines 48-49"; also see column 16, lines 40-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Olivier, to include accessing a network using a device, the accessing including providing associated identity information corresponding to the device; requesting data from a service accessible via the network, the request based on the associated identity information; determining if the request is an allowable request based on the associated identity information.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Olivier, by the teachings of Birrell et al. because accessing a network using a device, the accessing including providing associated identity information corresponding to the device; requesting data from a service accessible via the network, the request based on the associated identity information; determining if the request is an allowable request based on the associated identity information would allow the user to interchange useful information, in a number of different presentation modalities, in a timely and convenient manner (See Birrell et al., column 1, lines 21-30).

As to claim 22, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the document comprises an inbox document (See Birrell et al., column 9, lines 17-21, where "inbox document" is read on "mail message").

As to claim 35, Olivier teaches a computer-readable medium (See column 4, lines 48-49) having computer-executable instructions for:

if the request is allowable, constructing a document in response to the request, the document including at least part of the requested data and including at least part of a schema in markup language associated with the service (See column 5, lines 1-5; column 16, lines 25-29; column 25, lines 21-41), the schema providing structure and meaning to the inbox data and interpreted by the service running on the device (See *).

Olivier does not teach requesting data from a service accessible via a network, the request based on associated identity information; determining if the request is an allowable request based on the associated identity information.

Birrell et al. teaches a web-base electronic mail service apparatus and method using full text and label indexing (See abstract), in which he teaches requesting data from a service accessible via a network (See column 15, lines 58-63; column 16, lines 3-14), the request based on associated identity information (See column 5, lines 29-43, where “password” is read on “identity information”; also see column 13, line 41, where “log-in window” is read on “identity information”; also see column 16, lines 40-43);

determining if the request is an allowable request based on the associated identity information(See column 5, lines 29-43. It is inherent that in order to view inbox documents one must logon to an email account using a username and password as “identity information”; also see column 14, lines 48-49”; also see column 16, lines 40-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Olivier, to include requesting data from a service accessible via a network, the request based on associated identity information; determining if the request is an allowable request based on the associated identity information.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Olivier, by the teachings of Birrell et al. because requesting data from a service accessible via a network, the request based on associated identity information; determining if the request is an allowable request based on the associated identity information would allow the user to interchange useful information, in a number of different presentation modalities, in a timely and convenient manner (See Birrell et al., column 1, lines 21-30).

As to claim 36, Olivier as modified, teaches having further computer-executable instructions for sending the constructed document to a source of the request (See Birrell et al., column 13, lines 22-24).

As to claim 37, Olivier as modified, teaches having further computer-executable instructions for determining if the request is an allowable request based on the associated identity information (See Birrell et al., column 5, lines 41-45).

As to claim 39, Olivier as modified, teaches having further computer-executable instructions for denying the request for data based on the associated identity information (See Olivier, column 13, lines 15-20; column 17, lines 17-20).

As to claim 41, Olivier teaches a computer network (See column 4, lines 60-63), a method comprising,

the scope determined according to an inbox schema having inbox related fields arranged into a content document in a markup language with defined structures for the fields (See column 5, lines 1-5; column 16, lines 25-29; column 25, lines 21-41), wherein at least part of the inbox schema is included (See *).

Olivier does not teach receiving a request to manipulate inbox data in a logical inbox document, the request including associated identity information; determining a scope of access rights based on the identity information; and if the request is within the scope, manipulating at least one set of data in the logical inbox document that includes data therein according to the associated identity information, each set of data in the logical inbox document structured to correspond to a field in the content document.

Birrell et al. teaches a web-base electronic mail service apparatus and method using full text and label indexing (See abstract), in which he teaches receiving a request to manipulate inbox data in a logical inbox document (See column 5, lines 29-43), the request including associated identity information (See column 5, lines 29-43, where “password” is read on “identity information”; also see column 13, line 41, where “log-in window” is read on “identity information”; also see column 16, lines 40-43); determining

Art Unit: 2164

a scope of access rights based on the identity information (See column 5, lines 29-43; column 14, lines 48-49; column 16, lines 3-14);

and if the request is within the scope, manipulating at least one set of data in the logical inbox document that includes data therein according to the associated identity information, each set of data in the logical inbox document structured to correspond to a field in the content document (See column 9, lines 12-16. It is inherent that the "fields" (i.e. "to" etc.) are located on the "inbox document"; column 14, lines 63-67; column 15, lines 6-49).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Olivier, to include receiving a request to manipulate inbox data in a logical inbox document, the request including associated identity information; determining a scope of access rights based on the identity information; and if the request is within the scope, manipulating at least one set of data in the logical inbox document that includes data therein according to the associated identity information, each set of data in the logical inbox document structured to correspond to a field in the content document.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Olivier, by the teachings of Birrell et al. because receiving a request to manipulate inbox data in a logical inbox document, the request including associated identity information; determining a scope of access rights based on the identity information; and if the request is within the scope, manipulating at least one set of data in the logical inbox document that includes data therein according

to the associated identity information, each set of data in the logical inbox document structured to correspond to a field in the content document would allow the user to interchange useful information, in a number of different presentation modalities, in a timely and convenient manner (See Birrell et al., column 1, lines 21-30).

6. Claims 6, 23-34, 38, 40 and 42-43 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olivier (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,885) in view of Birrell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,551), as applied to claims 4-5, 7-22, 35-37, 39 and 41 above, and further in view of Helgeson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,643,652).

As to claim 6, Olivier as modified, still does not teach wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to an inbox display name.

Helgeson et al. teaches a method and apparatus for managing data exchange among systems in a network, in which he teaches wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to an inbox display name (See column 109, lines 44-48, where "inbox display name" is read on "Inbox identifier").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Olivier as modified, to include wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to an inbox display name.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Olivier as modified, by the teachings of Helgeson et al. because wherein the at least one defined field comprises data

corresponding to an inbox display name would help to manage data exchange among systems connected via a network (See Helgeson et al., column 2, lines 51-55).

As to claim 23, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the data comprises inbox data (See Olivier, column 3, lines 8-17; also see Helgeson et al., column 109, lines 37-57).

As to claim 24, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the service comprises an inbox service (See Helgeson et al., column 109, lines 49-60).

As to claim 25, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the schema comprises an inbox schema (See Olivier, column 5, lines 1-5; column 16, lines 25-29; also see Helgeson et al., column 14, lines 16-21).

As to claim 26, Olivier as modified, still does not teach manipulating the data requested if the request is determined to be an allowable request.

Helgeson et al. teaches a method and apparatus for managing data exchange among systems in a network, in which he teaches manipulating the data requested if the request is determined to be an allowable request (See Helgeson et al., column 19, lines 62-66; column 49, lines 46-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Olivier as modified, to include manipulating the data requested if the request is determined to be an allowable request.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Olivier as modified, by the teachings of Helgeson et al. because manipulating the data requested if the request is determined to be an allowable request would help to manage data exchange among systems connected via a network (See Helgeson et al., column 2, lines 51-55).

As to claim 27, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the manipulating comprises a query manipulation (See Birrell et al., column 5, lines 7-11, lines 30-40; also see Helgeson et al., column 19, lines 62-66; column 49, lines 46-53).

As to claim 28, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the manipulating comprises an insert manipulation (See Helgeson et al., column 19, lines 62-66; column 49, lines 46-53).

As to claim 29, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the manipulating comprises a delete manipulation (See Helgeson et al., column 19, lines 62-66; column 49, lines 46-53).

Art Unit: 2164

As to claim 30, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the manipulating comprises an update manipulation (See Helgeson et al., column 49, lines 46-53).

As to claim 31, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the manipulating comprises a replace manipulation (See Helgeson et al., column 19, lines 62-66).

As to claim 32, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the manipulating comprises a send message manipulation (See Helgeson et al., column 19, lines 62-66).

As to claim 33, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the manipulating comprises a save message manipulation (See Helgeson et al., column 19, lines 62-66).

As to claim 34, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein the manipulating comprises a copy message manipulation (See Helgeson et al., column 19, lines 62-66; column 49, lines 46-53).

As to claim 38, Olivier as modified, teaches having further computer-executable instructions for manipulating data stored in a data store based on the request for data (See Helgeson et al., column 19, lines 62-66; column 49, lines 46-53).

As to claim 40, Olivier as modified, still does not teach having further computer-executable instructions for constructing the document in an extensible markup language.

Helgeson et al. teaches a method and apparatus for managing data exchange among systems in a network, in which he teaches having further computer-executable instructions for constructing the document in an extensible markup language (See Helgeson et al., column 50, lines 54-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Olivier as modified, to include having further computer-executable instructions for constructing the document in an extensible markup language.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Olivier as modified, by the teachings of Helgeson et al. because having further computer-executable instructions for constructing the document in an extensible markup language would help to manage data exchange among systems connected via a network (See Helgeson et al., column 2, lines 51-55).

As to claim 42, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein manipulating at least one set of data comprises reading data from at least one field in the logical inbox document (See Birrell et al., column 9, lines 12-16. It is inherent that the "fields" (i.e. "to" etc.) are located on the "inbox document").

As to claim 43, Olivier as modified, teaches wherein manipulating at least one set of data comprises writing data to at least one field in the logical inbox document (See Birrell et al., column 14, lines 63-67; column 15, lines 6-49).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 08-December-2004, with respect to the rejected claims 4-43 have been fully considered but they are not found to be persuasive:

In response to applicants' arguments regarding "Olivier and Birrell, whether considered alone or in any permissible combination, do not teach or suggest each of the limitations of claim 4", the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because Olivier teaches an email inbox-schema, wherein a reply message can be created to in include part, if not all of the data from the inbox document (See column 16, lines 25-55). Olivier also teaches "message exchange" that can include internet pages which can include markup language (See column 25, lines 21-41). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicants' arguments regarding "Olivier, however simply does not teach, much less is even aware of constructing an actual inbox document that includes at least part of a schema", the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because Olivier teaches an email inbox-schema, wherein a reply

message can be created to include part, if not all of the data from the inbox document (See column 16, lines 25-55). Replying to an email message is constructing an inbox document containing schema. Furthermore, "inbox document" is a term that is not disclosed in the Specification. Terms such as "inbox schema" and "content document" are disclosed throughout the Specification, however "inbox document" is not and therefore it is unclear what is meant by an "inbox document". The examiner is reading, "email message" on the "inbox document". In Olivier, the reply message to an email contains schema.

In response to applicants' arguments regarding "no teaching or even any appreciation of the use of a schema in the manner suggested in claim 4 in the system disclosed by Olivier. Nowhere can there be found in Olivier an inbox schema in the form of a content document such that the schema may be practiced in a common networked environment, such as the internet". The arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because Olivier teaches an email inbox-schema, wherein a reply message can be created to include part, if not all of the data from the inbox document (See column 16, lines 25-55). Email is done using the Internet.

In response to applicants' arguments regarding "Birrell certainly cannot be constructed to teach a defined field with a sender's email address within the context of a schema for inbox data in a markup language", the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because Birrell teaches a message that contains fields where a "from" field can be viewed to see who or where the message was sent from (see Birrell, column 7, lines 46-49). It is also obvious in Olivier that when

a person reply's to an email document that the senders emails address is accessed in order to sent the reply.

In response to applicants' arguments regarding "neither Olivier nor Birrell disclose or suggest the recitation of claim 4, whether considered alone or in any permissible combination. Further, Helgeson certainly does not disclose or suggest any recitations in clam 4". The arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because Olivier teaches an email inbox-schema, wherein a reply message can be created to in include part, if not all of the data from the inbox document (See column 16, lines 25-55). Replying to an email message is constructing an inbox document containing schema.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mellissa M. Chojnacki whose telephone number is (571) 272-4076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

December 20, 2005
Mmc



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER